APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,431	04/10/2006	Jiro Kiyama	65325 (70904)	2093

21874   7590   05/09/2011
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER
HARVEY, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2481	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/09/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1. The examiner notes that the proposed amendments made to claim 61 raise new issues that would require further search and consideration and, additionally, are not believed to simplify the issues for Appeal.

2. With respect to the arguments submitted on pages 13-15 against the Section 103 rejections, *it is the examiner's position that the scope of the pending claims is broader than that which is argued by the applicant*. The following is noted:

> A) The Examiner's Position (summarized):
>
>> 1) The examiner maintains that the recited "ID" terminology is not specifically defined and, for example, can be broadly/fairly read on information that simply identifies the occurrence of a trigger event. However:
>>
>>> a) It is the examiner's position that Chung discloses a system in which in "software", in the form of a markup document, was provided to a DVD playback device, from a DVD, along with a stream of A/V content. As disclose, the markup document includes a first presentation functionality which is executed by the presentation (@3) to display retrieved image file contents on the display screen, and a second trigger event functionality for generating the trigger event that identify when the next identified image content is to be retrieved from the image files and displayed on the display screen, via the "execution" of the presentation functionality, in synchronism with the A/V content [Note paragraph 0034]; i.e., wherein the "process" resulting from the execution being one of presenting data.
>>>
>>> The claimed invention (e.g., of claim 1) differs from the system of Chung in that the claims recite that the synchronization (i.e., trigger) file is separate from the program file.
>>>
>>> Yoon et al recognized that such conventional configurations were undesirable in that they did not allow the image display content to be changed. To overcome this problem, Yoon et al. taught a configuration in which the trigger functionality ("index.syn") was separated from the presentation functionality via the creation of a respective files for each functionality [note paragraphs 0037 & 0060]. Further, the trigger file is modified to contain the required linkage between each filed name (ID) and time [note paragraph 0060]. Via such modifications, the desired updating of the DVD was made possible simply by replacing the trigger file and the image files. The examiner maintains that it would have been

obvious to have modified Chung to obtain these advantages by
moving the trigger functionality to its own file and modifying it to
include the required links to specific file names. The presentation
engine of the modified system would retrieve the identified image
content and execute the presentation script in response thereto.

B) With respect to the arguments that appear in the last paragraph on page 13:

    1) The examiner maintains that, as currently drafted, the claims do not
require the data and the sync information to be managed within a same
file as is argued;

    2) The examiner points out that the DVD of Yoon et al includes the
"original" versions the separate files recorded thereon; i.e., regardless of
the fact that these original versions can be updated/upgraded via "new
versions" thereof by a server.   The ability to update these files is relied
upon only for the motivation to modify Chung accordingly with a separate
sync file.

C) With respect to the arguments that appear in the first three paragraphs of
page 14:

    1) The examiner maintains that the ID in Yoon et al is the "file name"
which, when provided to the iDVD Engine, causes the ENAV
application/program "to be executed" by the iDVD Engine thereby causing
the content file corresponding to the file name to be retrieved, converted,
outputted, and displayed in an synchronous fashion with respect to the AV
content provided from the DVD Engine (i.e., the identified/"registered"
process); and

    2) The limitation set forth in the third paragraph does not appear to be
recited in the claim(s).

D) With respect to the arguments that appear on page 15, it is believed that they
have been fully addressed above; i.e., again, it is the examiner position that the
scope of the claims is broader than the scope being argued.

3.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID E. HARVEY whose telephone number is (571) 272-7345. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:00AM to 3PM.

  If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Peter-Anthony Pappas, can be reached on (571) 272-7646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

  Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DAVID E HARVEY/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2481

DAVID E HARVEY
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2481